

FOIAB5

Approved For Release 2007/03/08 : CIA-RDP80B01495R000400050029-5

Next 2 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2007/03/08 : CIA-RDP80B01495R000400050029-5

THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE AND NON-GPO PUBLICATIONS

JOE MOREHEAD

Asst. Professor
School of Library and Information Science
S.U.N.Y. at Albany
Albany, N.Y. 12203

ABSTRACT

Discusses the interpretation and implementation to date of the so-called "non-GPO" clause in the 1962 Depository Library Act. The implications of this provision to include non-GPO documents in the Monthly Catalog and make them available to depository libraries are examined and the reactions of the Superintendent of Documents are reported. Funding and other problems inherent in carrying out this provision of the 1962 Act are cited in terms of testimony by the Superintendent in the published Hearings before the Appropriations Subcommittee of Congress. The author contends that the GPO is doing less than it can to get the program into high gear.

In Title 44 of the *United States Code* are found the general and permanent laws relating to public printing and documents. When the 1962 Depository Library Act (PL 87-579) was passed, a number of provisions of Chapter 19 of Title 44 were changed to reflect the new legislation. Whereas the several provisions contained procedures crucial to the conduct of the depository library program, none was greeted with as much interest if not apprehension as the so-called "non-GPO" clause. The enabling language, incorporated into Section 1902 of Title 44 in almost casual fashion, belied in its simplicity the significance of the change: "Each component of the Government shall furnish the Superintendent of Documents a list of such publications it issued during the previous month, that were obtained from sources other than the Government Printing Office."

Indeed, Carper W. Buckley, the genial and capable Superintendent of Documents at that time, was not unaware of the implications of the provision to include non-GPO documents in the *Monthly Catalog* and make them available to depository libraries. Reflecting upon the decision, he noted that

The magnitude in scope of the proposal, the production and budgetary problems that would undoubtedly result to the Government agencies producing these publications, the fact that the Superintendent of Documents exercised no control over the publications, and the considerable cost factors to both our Office and other components of Government, were the reasons for our expressed doubt that it would be possible for this portion of the new law to be implemented in the manner that we would wish it to be and with the same result as that part of the program involving publications printed by the Government Printing Office.¹

Superintendent Buckley's fears were not unfounded. The program was not begun until January, 1965, with the Bureau of the Census and the Interior Department the first administrative units to participate, and with a paltry sum of \$57,000 for FY 1965 authorized by the House subcommittee on legislative branch appropriations. However, Buckley could report that by May, 1966, over 650,000 copies of Census Bureau documents of a non-GPO nature had been distributed to the depositories; but beneath this statement lay a huge irony. As Buckley had feared, producing the non-GPO documents did tax the in-house capabilities of Census. Interior, too, found distribution of its Bureau of Mines *Circulars and Reports of Investigations* difficult. Under the provision of the 1962 legislation, the non-GPO publications sent to the Superintendent were to be funded by the participating agency. The Commerce Department found it necessary to send some of its preliminary Census reports to GPO to be printed in order "to relieve the pressure on its own printing facilities." Interior's field printing plant in Pittsburgh decided to issue a weekly bulletin incorporating certain series "to be printed at GPO." The 1962 Act thus appeared to "force more departmental printing into GPO," which, incidentally, would then be funded by GPO rather than by the participating agencies. Accordingly, we were observing the ludicrous situation developing whereby "non-GPO" documents were being printed at the GPO, the *reductio ad absurdum* of the intent of the Act.²

The Federal Documents Task Force of ALA's recently established Government Documents Round Table recommended what is only the latest in a series of suggestions by way of complaints that GPO is not managing this "non-GPO" provision of the 1962 law. Almost since mid-1966 librarians have questioned the management of this provision. The Task Force's recommendation urges, in 1973, that "the law be revised to provide that non-GPO publications furnished by the issuing agencies should be charged to appropriations allotted to the Superintendent of Documents, and that the Superintendent plan and program for such input to justify the granting of adequate appropriations." Moreover, the loophole which permits the participating agency to determine the "public interest or educational value" of the document must be plugged if the program is to be viable.³ In reaction to librarians' persistent complaints, spokesmen for the GPO and their colleagues in the Office of the Superintendent have over the last eight years repeatedly vowed the good fight. Claiming to be responsive to the librarians' desires, they have laid their failure to deliver at the doorstep of a niggardly Congress. The old fiscal ploy, which has worked so well in the halls of government, has been invoked time and again. But does it withstand scrutiny?

Each year the Public Printer and the Superintendent of Documents journey, hat in hand, to Capitol Hill to present and justify their budget to the committee which exercises oversight, in this case the subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations. The bulk of testimony is usually presented at the House subcommittee, the Senate equivalent reg-

¹Carper W. Buckley, "Implementation of the Federal Depository Library Act of 1962," *Library Trends*, 15 (July, 1966), 29.

²Ibid., pp. 33-34.

³*Documents to the People*, Volume 1, Number 3 (May, 1973), p. 22.

istering largely confirmatory action. Both subcommittees report to their respective Appropriations Committees and the hearings are ordered printed; the hearings are duly made available as a matter of public record and, indeed, are offered to depository libraries that subscribe to Items 1011 (House) and 1033 (Senate). If evidence exists to demonstrate the GPO's sincerity in fighting for funds to conduct properly the non-GPO provision of the 1962 Act, it is surely to be found in this public record.

A momentary digression. The writer arrived at the above exploration of GPO intent in fortuitous fashion. In connection with another point that seemed puzzling, I had been trying to verify a statement by Rowland E. Darling, then Deputy Superintendent of Documents, given to the Senate subcommittee in 1971, that mentioned the State Department as one of the units participating in the non-GPO project.⁴ The latest *List of Classes of United States Government Publications Available for Selection by Depository Libraries* indicated no item categories of non-GPO Department of State documents offered to depository libraries, but I realized that this was not sufficient to render Mr. Darling's assertion "inoperative." Painstakingly a depository library clerk went through the Shipments Lists from June, 1971, the date of the Senate testimony, to the present, including the Monthly Surveys for that period. No record of non-GPO series from State was discovered. Darling's statement of fact to the subcommittee is open to question. Non-GPO materials from the State Department may have been offered subscribers through NTIS, but that arrangement in any event would not be apposite to the provision of the 1962 legislation.

When the Superintendent of Documents testifies before the House and Senate Appropriations subcommittees each year, he submits a statement supporting the fiscal year estimate for salaries and expenses, then answers questions or proffers suggestions. Obviously the committee members cannot be conversant with anything but the broadest areas of management of the operation; their questions tend to show that they are most concerned with the continuing health and prosperity of the *Congressional Record*. The huglemen and haruspices of the Office of the Superintendent must therefore promote in a direct and positive way any program they are responsible for; they must present facts to the Members and be aggressive in asking for accompanying funds. For example, if the Superintendent wishes to gain more monies and control over the non-GPO provision of the 1962 Act, he must present the data and argue his case before the subcommittee.

An examination of the statements and the testimony in the published hearings over the last few years reveals quite the opposite policy. Some examples will suffice to give the flavor of GPO, via SuDocs, interest in actively pursuing the non-GPO problem:

FY 1974: In his statement, the Superintendent noted that "the servicing of designated depository libraries continues on a daily basis to the satisfaction of the majority of the libraries. Multiple shipments of publications are mailed to the depository libraries on an around-the-clock basis." In his testimony nothing was said concerning non-GPO publications.

FY 1973: In the statement it was claimed that "the depository library program is flourishing." After the usual statistics that tend to impress the outsider, Mr. Kling noted that "a sum of \$5,765 for postage to mail an estimated 150,000 additional publications, not produced by the Government Printing Office, but provided for by law, has also been requested." In testimony, neither Kling nor Darling mentioned anything about the non-GPO situation.

FY 1972: The statement contained a clause requesting "\$3000 for the postage that will be required to mail an estimated 150,000 additional publications not produced by the

⁴U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1972*, Hearing, 92d Cong., 1st Sess., June 7, 1971 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1971), p. 327.

Government Printing Office to depository libraries as provided for by law." In House testimony nothing was mentioned concerning non-GPO documents. In Senate testimony, as noted above, Mr. Darling cited Department of State participation in the non-GPO program, as well as Census, Interior and Labor which correctly are sending some of their non-GPO items to depository libraries. But he did so only in response to a question Senator Hollings asked about the \$3000 postage request; normally even fiscal-minded Members are not so eagle-eyed. The Senator asked Darling what publications his office distributed which are not produced by GPO. His response in full is worth noting:

Mr. Darling. Mr. Chairman, these are the publications that are printed within the in-house printing facilities of the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

With the enactment of the 1962 depository legislation, this was one of the primary points of discussion by the librarians that attended the hearings or submitted statements for consideration. There are a great number of publications that by their very nature would not be economically feasible to order printed through the Government Printing Office where only a very few copies are required. Usually this is material that resembles mimeographed or multilith copy.

The librarians felt that this left a gap in their holdings. As a result of the 1962 legislation we were asked to work with the various departments and agencies of the executive departments asking them to bring these publications into the Federal depository library distribution program. We have been working since the enactment of the 1962 legislation with various departments.

As a matter of fact, we are currently working with the Library of Congress, Environmental Protection Agency, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Department of Agriculture. We have brought in the Bureau of the Census, Department of the Interior, Department of Labor, and the Department of State.

Hopefully, as we can get the cooperation of the other agencies, we will be able to bring more and more of these publications into the program.⁵

FY 1971: The statement again requests "\$3,000 for the postage that will be required to mail an estimated 150,000 additional publications not produced by the Government Printing Office to depository libraries, as provided for by law." No testimony touched upon the non-GPO problem.

FY 1970: In the statement for this year the postage estimate for GPO and non-GPO material was lumped for established depository libraries; SuDocs requested non-GPO postage of \$630 for an estimated 40 new depositories. Those amounts included "the estimate of the postage charge that would be required to bring into the depository distribution program during 1970 the publications of public interest or educational value of at least one additional Government department or agency which are not produced by the Government Printing Office, but which are required to be offered to depository libraries under the provisions of the Depository Library Act of 1962." When asked what additional department SuDocs planned to bring in, the Superintendent replied: "We are thinking of either the Treasury Department or the Library of Congress, or both." Apparently that plan was abandoned, for no non-GPO items in the current *List of Classes* indicate a non-GPO series available to libraries from LC or Treasury.

This record scarcely indicates an active, aggressive effort on the part of the GPO to respond to what Mr. Darling said was "one of the primary points of discussion" during the hearings prior to enactment of the 1962 legislation. The five year record shows an

⁵Ibid., pp. 326-27.

unusual equanimity. If more agencies are to be brought in to the non-GPO program, the constant of 150,000 appears suspicious. If SuDocs could be mistaken about State Department participation in the non-GPO program, how much reliability can librarians invest in other statements by officers of the GPO concerning complaints voiced and putatively shared by profession and agency alike?

This is not the place to argue the merits of the non-GPO materials, regarding which librarians are in great disagreement. Those librarians who believe that much non-GPO materials are not worth the bother may applaud what seems like a holding action on the part of the GPO; in any event they are not obliged to subscribe to the items. But librarians who see the need for these reports, series and monographs are advised that the GPO is doing less than it can to get the program into high gear. At least that conclusion is, in this writer's judgment, warranted by what is revealed — by its absence — in public testimony.

Comment on Preceeding Article:

While I was Superintendent of Documents, arrangement was made with representatives of the Department of State whereby any publications of that department which were of public interest or educational value and which were produced outside the Government Printing Office, would be provided for distribution to depository libraries. The arrangement was substantially the same as that previously made with the Bureau of the Census, Department of the Interior, and Department of Labor. The State Department representatives advised at the time, however, that all of its publications in the specified categories were being produced by the Government Printing Office. This situation was, apparently, still continuing at the time of Mr. Darling's statement before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate which is questioned in this article.

Regarding any State Department publication produced by NTIS, such an issuance would be a cooperative publication, specifically excluded from the depository program by the Depository Library Act of 1962.

The future distribution of Non-G.P.O. publications to depository libraries may be affected significantly by the establishment throughout the United States of Regional Printing Procurement Offices of the Government Printing Office. It has been my understanding that the printing produced through these regional offices is that which would have been produced in earlier years in Government departmental and field printing plants. If so, such printing will then become G.P.O. printing and its distribution to the depositories will be governed by the same procedures followed in the distribution of publications produced in the main G.P.O. plant in Washington.

Carper W. Buckley
(U.S. Superintendent of Documents—1953 to 1970)
Department of Library Science
Catholic University
Washington, D.C.



Implementation of the Federal Depository Library Act of 1962

CARPER W. BUCKLEY

THE DEPOSITORY LIBRARY ACT of 1962 marked the first general revision of the laws governing the distribution of United States Government publications to designated depositories since the enactment of the General Printing Act of 1895.

The system that had evolved by 1962, under the authority of the basic legislation of 1895 plus some specific amendments, comprised 594 depository libraries located in all of the states of the union plus most of the territories. Improvements in the mechanics of the procedure had reached a point where at least one mailing a day was being made to each depository. The depository system, at the time of the passage of the new law, was serving to get into the libraries in the minimum time, the publications printed by the Government Printing Office.

Despite the fact that the existing depository program was a good and an effective one, there were certain recognized flaws in it. In the late 1930's a proposal by the American Library Association for a full-fledged survey of all depository libraries had just missed adoption because the required funds could not be made available. Probably with some justification there was a considerable feeling that such a survey would have disclosed the need for the relocation of certain depositories in order better to serve the interests of the entire state involved. Those who sought such a survey hoped also that, in the process of any relocation found necessary, there could be accomplished the elimination of some depositories which, if their original designation had been justifiable, had ceased to be the type of library in the area which could, at that later time, best serve the interest of the public.

Because of the changes resulting from shifting population and economic considerations, as well as the desire of additional libraries to achieve depository status, there were frequent requests for the creation

Mr. Buckley is U.S. Superintendent of Documents.

CARPER W. BUCKLEY

of new depositories in areas where there was no vacancy for an additional designation. Despite the fact that the law allowed him no discretion in the matter, the negative answer to these requests by the Superintendent of Documents left many librarians with the feeling that he was the primary obstacle to their being able to secure the depository privilege for their libraries.

Another difficulty encountered by the librarians of many depositories in living with the laws in effect prior to 1962 was their inability to dispose of depository publications as freely as they thought necessary, e.g., to solve critical space limitations. The Office of the Superintendent of Documents had paved the way for some relief of this situation by specifying in the instructions to depositories so-called ephemeral material which could be disposed of without the need for other specific authorization. Permission was also extended to depositories to substitute commercially-produced microfacsimile reproductions for depository copies, where the library maintained suitable reading equipment, provided the material was adequately indexed for reference use. Finally, there were in existence in 1962 two voluntary arrangements for regional libraries which made it possible for other depositories in the areas involved to be more liberal in disposing of some parts of their depository collections. These two experimental arrangements in Wisconsin and New York State, which were in operation with the approval and cooperation of the Superintendent of Documents, had proved so successful that there were tentative plans for similar undertakings in several other areas at the time the revised legislation was enacted.

It was to this existing depository program that the changes embodied in Public Law 87-579 were added on August 9, 1962. Under the provisions of that law the number of Representative depository library designations was increased from one to not more than two for each Congressional District and the number of Senatorial designations was also increased to no more than two for a Senator, of each class.

We were happy to see the new law formalize the arrangement for regional depositories, which had proved successful in the two instances in which it had been tried voluntarily. Libraries served by a regional depository could dispose of Government publications more than five years old, with the permission of the regional. The authority of the Superintendent of Documents under the old law to permit the disposition of publications was removed. Other than under the regional arrangement, the only disposition now permitted is of superseded publication or those issued later in bound form.

Implementation of the Federal Depository Library Act of 1962

The issuance by the Superintendent of Documents of a current classified listing of Government publications containing annotations of contents, for use by designated depository libraries in making their selections, was specifically provided for also in the new Depository Library Law.

Other changes were the requirement of justification and certification of the need for additional depositories and approval by the state library agency or the existing depository in the Congressional District, the increase from 1,000 to 10,000 in the number of other publications that a library must have to qualify as a depository, and the requirement that the Superintendent of Documents' appropriation would thereafter defray the postage cost which the depository libraries had been required to assume by earlier legislation. While most of the foregoing changes would require added resources for the Office of the Superintendent of Documents and there would be inevitable delays in their complete accomplishment, there was nothing in any of them that raised any serious doubt that they could be implemented in the manner prescribed in the law.

The most extensive change in the depository program provided by the 1962 law was that whereby other components of the United States Government were required to provide to the Superintendent of Documents, for distribution to those depositories which had selected them, the appropriate number of copies of their unclassified publications of public interest or educational value not produced by the Government Printing Office but in departmental and field printing plants. It was this provision of the proposed legislation about which we at the Government Printing Office had raised a question before its enactment. The magnitude in scope of the proposal, the production and budgetary problems that would undoubtedly result to the Government agencies producing these publications, the fact that the Superintendent of Documents exercised no control over the publications, and the considerable cost factors to both our Office and other components of Government, were the reasons for our expressed doubt that it would be possible for this portion of the new law to be implemented in the manner that we would wish it to be and with the same result as that part of the program involving publications printed by the Government Printing Office.

The fiscal year had begun July 1 preceding passage of Public Law 87-579, but by October 1, 1962, we had to estimate the additional resources which the administration of the new law would require for the

CARPER W. BUCKLEY

Office of the Superintendent of Documents during the next fiscal year to begin July 1, 1963. This hurried calculation was necessarily based on a very rough estimate of the number of additional depositories that we could expect to be designated during the next fiscal year, and an even rougher one of the percentage of non-GPO publications which could be identified within that time as coming within the purview of the new law and which we could conceivably secure for distribution. Based on the known factors of the average cost for each depository of providing the publications, plus the cost of distribution, including postage, we estimated the number of additional libraries that would be added during the forthcoming year, and were able to make a definite request for the resources we would need to provide the service to that number of additional depositories insofar as publications printed by the Government Printing Office were concerned. There was no factual basis on which to rely in making a similar request to cover the distribution to the estimated total number of depositories of publications printed in Government departmental and field plants. In view of the short time before the budget request had to be submitted, we assumed that the volume of non-GPO publications to be distributed and the related distribution costs would be approximately the same for these publications as for those produced by the Government Printing Office. We did estimate a reduced figure for the postage that would be required to mail the non-GPO publications, in the belief that they would not include bound volumes and as many large books, but would comprise mostly releases and related material. Our request for the total estimated cost of obtaining and distributing the non-GPO publications for the year was \$174,151.

A letter had been directed by the Public Printer in September 1962 to the heads of all United States Government departments and agencies, outlining provisions of the newly-enacted depository law and requesting the designation of an official in each department or agency, familiar with its publishing program, to work with the Superintendent of Documents in the administration of the system required by the law. These liaison officials were readily designated, and we then requested them to begin a review of their publishing programs to identify tentatively those publications not printed by the Government Printing Office which were of public interest or educational value.

In January 1963, the Public Printer invited seven distinguished librarians to serve as members of an Advisory Committee on Depository Libraries. This action was in accord with a desire which had been

Implementation of the Federal Depository Library Act of 1962

expressed before the Senate Committee on Rules, during the hearings on the revised depository library legislation. The selections were made from a list submitted by the President of the American Library Association of those regarded by him as having special qualifications to serve in such a capacity. All of those invited agreed to serve and still constitute the Advisory Committee, viz., Dr. Benjamin E. Powell, Librarian of Duke University, Mr. Thomas S. Shaw of the Library School of Louisiana State University (then Chairman of the American Library Association Public Documents Interdivisional Committee), Mr. Paul Howard, Librarian of the U.S. Department of the Interior, Mrs. Robert D. Leigh, the California State Librarian, Mr. Roger H. McDonough, Director, Division of the New Jersey State Library, Mr. Edwin Castagna, Director of the Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, and Miss Rae Elizabeth Rips, Chief of the History and Travel Department of the Detroit Public Library.

I have been privileged to meet with the Advisory Committee on four occasions, two of which were in the Office of the Public Printer. Although the discussions at these meetings have been confined largely to details of the necessarily slow step-by-step progress being made in implementing certain phases of the program under the new law, we have found them interesting and helpful. I certainly appreciate the willingness of the members of the Committee to take time from their busy schedules to advise us in this difficult area of our operations. I hope that, as we progress in the program, there will be considerations for this group which will be more consistent with the great abilities and responsibilities of its members than the somewhat elementary problems we have brought to them in the early stages of this effort.¹

The Legislative Appropriation Act of 1964, enacted in December, 1963, granted the funds requested for initiating the expanded depository program with publications produced by the Government Printing Office. We were able, subsequently, to make the necessary physical alterations in space, equipment etc., and to assign the necessary additional personnel to this task, which was begun during the early part of 1964.

Congress decided, however, to disallow the entire amount that had been requested for beginning the implementation of that part of the 1962 law which required the depository distribution of the non-GPO publications. In so doing the House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations, in its report, directed the Superintendent of Documents "to continue his exploratory relationships with the agencies, so

CARPER W. BUCKLEY

that he can be in a better position to size up the problem and definitize a budget for it."²

Pursuant to the direction of the House Appropriations Committee, we began efforts to arrive at a tentative identification, in cooperation with officials of the Bureau of the Census and the Department of the Interior, of certain publications of those two agencies which were not produced by the Government Printing Office and which were believed to come within the criteria established by the Depository Act for distribution to depository libraries. We based our estimate of the number of depositories which would select this non-GPO Census and Interior material on the percentage of the total number of depository libraries which were selecting similar-type Census and Interior publications printed by the Government Printing Office and already offered in the depository distribution program. The detailed computation on that basis was submitted to the House Appropriations Committee as part of the justification for funds to operate the Office of the Superintendent of Documents for fiscal year 1965, including a requested \$57,000 to begin the implementation of the non-GPO portion of the Act.³

At the House hearings on the Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1965, there was discussion again of the magnitude in scope and total cost of the depository program provided for by the 1962 law. Responding to a question about our future plans beyond 1965, I expressed the belief that we could, perhaps, find other Government departments and agencies to whose non-GPO publications this program could be extended in the years ahead.⁴ The Chairman of the Subcommittee also asked what our course of action would be "If this depository library situation becomes unwieldy or out of hand." I informed him that our discussions with responsible members of the library profession had given us assurance that we would have their support in coming before the Committee to report the progress being made in the program, and that if experience should prove that the law was not capable of implementation, we would be able to discuss some modification of it with the library representatives.⁵

At the hearings on the same measure before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, Edmon Low, Librarian of Oklahoma State University, presented an able statement in support of our request for \$57,000 to conduct the proposed trial program.⁶ Low, recognizing the difficulties involved in a full-scale implementation of the non-GPO portion of the Depository Act, assured the Chairman of the Senate

Implementation of the Federal Depository Library Act of 1962

subcommittee that he felt the plan as outlined would be a satisfactory beginning. Public Law 88-454, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, enacted on August 20, 1964, allowed the requested sum of \$57,000 for beginning the program in the manner which had been outlined to the Appropriations Committees.

The fact that the appropriation act was late in being passed by Congress, and that there was a great deal of preliminary work to be done before the flow of the material from the two agencies to our Office could begin, made it necessary for us to postpone until January 1965 the distribution of the first Census Bureau publications produced outside the Government Printing Office. Once a beginning was made, however, the Census Bureau material has continued to reach us without major incident. By May 1, 1966, more than 650,000 copies of Census Bureau publications had been distributed to the depositories. An anticipated effect on our work load is apparent, and it has been necessary to make many extra mailings to depository libraries, as a result of the additional material made available.

We have also completed surveys on a number of additional series of Interior Department publications, which will greatly increase this distribution during the remainder of the current year. Annotations, as provided for in the Depository Act of 1962, were prepared by the Interior Department to aid the depositories in making their selections. Progress in improving the annotations generally and in the listing of publications groups for selection by depository libraries has been steady but slow, due to the ever-present difficulty of finding personnel who can be spared from other programs to provide this improvement.

The official of the Office of the Superintendent of Documents who was in direct charge of administering the expanded depository program until his untimely death on April 26, 1966, was Mr. Joseph A. King, Assistant Superintendent of Documents and formerly the Chief of our Library. In December, 1965, Mr. King gave me the following observations based on experience in offering the Census Bureau and Interior Department non-GPO publications to depository libraries:

Initially we used many established distributions for some of the Census Bureau non-GPO publications where they were in the same Superintendent of Documents' classification or we felt they were related material which the same selecting libraries would be interested in receiving. However, we could not do this for all of them. For example, the Preliminary Reports on the quinquennial Census of Agriculture are issued for each county in the United States whereas the

CARPER W. BUCKLEY

final GPO printed reports are by States. Since there are over 1,000 counties in the United States, we had to set up 52 separate distribution lists for these preliminary reports as it was felt that not all libraries selecting the final GPO-printed State reports would want all the separate county reports. This proved true and only about 55 percent of the libraries selected the preliminary county reports in relation to those which select the final State reports.

The effects of the non-GPO distribution program for depository libraries are already being felt by the two agencies presently cooperating in the program. Much of the Bureau of Census releases such as the Current Industrial Reports are wanted by industry just as soon as they are compiled. Producing the extra copies each day that are needed for depository distribution is taxing the limited facilities of the Department of Commerce for in-house reproduction and causing delays in the issuance of this material. To overcome this, the Census Bureau is planning to issue experimentally a daily bulletin incorporating various releases. This would be put into the Government Printing Office to be printed if the experiment is accepted, and thereby take the pressure off the Commerce printing plant.

The Department of the Interior is also concerned about the extra copies it has to produce of the Bureau of Mines series of Information Circulars and Reports of Investigations. While some issues have for several years been printed at GPO, a large number have been produced at the Interior Department field printing plant at Pittsburgh. The Department is now considering the issuance of a weekly bulletin incorporating these series, to be printed at GPO.

The net result, if these two proposals materialize, would be an increase in the cost to this Office for the depository program since, under the 1962 Act, if the publications are printed through the GPO we pay for their printing, but if produced within a department or agency, it pays the cost of printing. Incidentally, the Department of Commerce has already found it necessary to have some of its preliminary Census reports, which it would normally produce, printed by GPO to relieve the pressure on its own printing facilities. Whether the effects of the non-GPO publications provisions of the 1962 Act will force more departmental printing into GPO remains to be seen, but there certainly seems to be a trend in that direction.

The provision for the establishment of regional depositories has been accomplished to the extent that there are now 35 such depositories located in 29 States. There are many things that must be considered by a library before it undertakes the heavy additional responsibility of a regional depository. There are also questions of detailed procedure under this phase of the law which are constantly

Implementation of the Federal Depository Library Act of 1962

arising. We are working with the libraries to resolve these as they develop. It may well be that, in time our experience and that of the regional libraries can provide a basis for the development of satisfactory rules, regulations and instructions to guide regional depositories in their operations. We are appreciative of the heavy responsibility placed by the law on these key depositories and well aware also that one of the shortcomings often attributed to the earlier depository laws and regulations was their inflexibility. It would seem unwise for us to attempt to standardize in a hurry regulations for all of the regionals, with their varying and often unique problems.

Undoubtedly, we shall be called on to make some evaluation of the results of the initial implementation of the Depository Act of 1962 as it relates to the non-GPO publications of the two Government organizations with which we have been able to begin the program. We shall do this on the basis of all factors which have been developed by our experience as well as those pertinent to the operations of the Government organizations concerned, insofar as these can be ascertained. On the results of that evaluation will probably rest the determination of whether our Office will be provided with resources for its continuation with the two agencies with which we are now working, and for its extension to the non-GPO publications of other Government agencies.

In anticipation of a continuation, with expansion as found possible, we are exploring with the Department of Labor the matter of its in-house produced publications which would come within the purview of the 1962 law. From this study and the records maintained by our Office, we can make a preliminary estimate that the annual distribution of non-GPO Labor Department publications would amount to approximately 200,000 copies. As we did earlier, in the case of the Census and Interior Department publications, the initial estimate is based on the average number of depositories which now select GPO-produced Department of Labor publications. We plan to include in our request for resources for the fiscal year 1967 the necessary amount to provide for the extension of the program to the Labor Department publications.

Progress in this phase of the program has been piecemeal, as planned, and slower in some instances than could be foreseen, but we have moved into the area of actual distribution of non-GPO publications to depository libraries for the first time and can expect that this experience will continue to provide much-needed factual data in a field in which we have been forced to rely heretofore on information which was necessarily speculative to a great extent. With 866 de-

CARPER W. BUCKLEY

positories designated to date, implementation of the other provisions of the 1962 Depository Library Act is proceeding smoothly and we can anticipate no serious obstacles to this continued progress beyond those inherent in the critical problems of space and personnel, which, with its tremendous and growing work load, our Office must always face.

References

1. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Rules and Administration. Subcommittee on the Library. *Depository Libraries, Hearings before Subcommittee on Library, Committee on Rules and Administration*. U.S. Senate on S. 2029 and H. R. 8141, March 15 and 16, 1962. Washington, U.S.G.P.O., 1962, p. 75.
2. 88th Congress, 1st Session, *House Report No. 369*, p. 24.
3. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1965. *Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations*. House of Representatives, 88th Congress, 2nd Session. Washington, U.S.G.P.O., 1965, p. 372.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 377.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 381.
6. U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Appropriations. Legislative Branch Appropriations. *Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations*. U.S. Senate, 88th Congress, 2nd Session, on H.R. 10723. Washington, U.S. G.P.O., 1965, p. 122.